



<https://publications.dainst.org>

# iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

## Victor Parker The Dates of the Messenian Wars

aus / from

### Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **21 • 1991**

Seite / Page **25–48**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1125/5492> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1991-21-p25-48-v5492.4

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

**©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://dainst.org)

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

VICTOR PARKER

## The Dates of the Messenian Wars

It has long been recognized that Pausanias' history of the First Messenian War is hardly any history at all. LIONEL PEARSON<sup>1</sup> has effectively discussed his «sources», and there is no need to go through that again here. What mystifies, is that Pausanias' dates for the First Messenian War receive respect: 743–724.<sup>2</sup> Tyrtaeus states that the grandchildren of the warriors of the First Messenian War fought in the second.<sup>3</sup> So great is the adulation of Pausanias' dates for the First Messenian War, that historians unflinchingly date Tyrtaeus and the Second Messenian War to the middle of the seventh century.<sup>4</sup> As Pausanias' dates for the Second Messenian War (685–668<sup>5</sup>) conflict with his dates for the first, they are rejected out of hand.

Both of Pausanias' dates are, of course, Hellenistic.<sup>6</sup> We know all too well that

---

<sup>1</sup> L. PEARSON, *The Pseudo-History of Messenia and its Authors*, *Historia* 11, 1962, 397–426. The major «source» for the pseudo-history of the First Messenian War was Myron of Priene.

<sup>2</sup> Pausanias 4, 5, 10; 4, 13, 7. F. JACOBY, *Apollodors Chronik*, Berlin 1902, 128–130, following P. KOHLMANN, *Quaestiones Messeniaca*, Diss. Bonn 1866, 47–50, attributes these dates to Sosibius. The attribution is certainly possible, since the known Sosibian dates for the Trojan War, King Charilaus, and King Nicander (Sosibius, FGrH, 595, fr. 1–2) are consistently a few years below the corresponding Apollodoran dates (see KOHLMANN'S tables, 48–49). Nevertheless, the extrapolation is hazardous, since we simply do not know how long Theopompus reigned on the Sosibian chronology; nor do we know for a fact that Sosibius gave exact dates for the Messenian Wars. At any rate, it is not germane to the purpose of this paper whether the dates are Pausanias', Myron's, or Sosibius'. All three are authors of Hellenistic or Roman times; their dates will have been based on genealogical evidence derived from the Spartan kinglists.

<sup>3</sup> Tyrtaeus, fr. 5 WEST.

<sup>4</sup> The method merits no discussion. Better to date Tyrtaeus (see below) and thus the second war – and then to use Tyrtaeus to date the first war.

<sup>5</sup> Pausanias 4, 15, 1; 4, 23, 4.

<sup>6</sup> Apollodorus must have believed the war to be even earlier and to have ended around 738/737: the last year of King Theopompus' life. Eusebius in the Armenian Canon dates the conquest of Messenia to 734, while Jerome dates it to 735. These dates probably represent Apollodorus' chronology. JACOBY, *Apollodors Chronik*, 128–130, assumes that Myron of Priene, Pausanias' source for the First Messenian War, reflects Apollodorus. As Myron lets King Theopompus die shortly before the end of the war, JACOBY assumes that Apollodorus must have done the same. Apollodorus could not possibly have let Theopompus die before the end of the war, because it is inconceivable that Apollodorus did not know of Tyrtaeus, fr. 5 WEST. At any rate the dates ca. 755–735 are simply too high.

dates in early Greek history are often too early: they were based on genealogies, such that one generation averaged forty years.<sup>7</sup> No historical dynasty has ever been equal to the exacting task set by Greek chronographers; there is therefore a suspicion – it is only a suspicion – that Pausanias' dates are a priori too high if they ultimately derive from guesses based on the Spartan kinglists or other genealogies.

We know another chronology, antecedent to the Hellenistic. Plutarch has recorded for us, that Epaminondas, when listing his accomplishments while on trial for his life, announced that he had liberated Messenia after 230 years of subjection.<sup>8</sup> The date works out to about 600 for the end of the second war. Thus a guess at the dates of the second conflict: ca. 620–600. Tyrtaeus, as we have seen, records that King Theopompus and the «fathers of our fathers»<sup>9</sup> subjugated Messenia in the first war. Venturing 60–70 years or so<sup>10</sup> for two generations: ca. 690–670<sup>11</sup> for the earlier war. There is always a tendency, when judging competing dates in early Greek history, to choose the lower. When the origin of the lower chronology is manifestly antecedent to that of the higher, that tendency grows stronger.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> For this problem see (still) A. R. BURN, *Dates in early Greek History*, JHS 55, 1935, 130–146.

<sup>8</sup> Plutarch, *mor.* 194 B. Repeated, Aelian, *Varia Historia* 13, 42. There are three ways of dealing with this evidence: 1.) This is the Second Messenian War (J. BELOCH, *Griechische Geschichte* I. 2<sup>2</sup>, 262–269, – who fails to see that this necessitates a lower date for the first war); 2.) This represents the dying embers of Messenian resistance after the second war (G. L. HUXLEY, *Early Sparta*, London 1962, 57–58, and P. CARTLEDGE, *Sparta and Lakonia*, London 1979, 128, – who fail to see that forty to fifty years is rather a long time for embers to be a-dying); and 3.) This is a Messenian Revolt independent of the second war (WADE-GERY, see appendix I – who fails to see that it could be the second war, if the high dating for the first war were dropped). Only three writers have interpreted this datum aright: B. NIESE, *Die ältere Geschichte Messeniens*, *Hermes* 26, 1891, 31–32, (long since forgotten); T. LENSCHAU, *Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte im VII. u. VI. Jahrh. v. Chr.*, *Philologus* 91, 1936, 297 (ignored); and A. H. M. JONES, *Sparta*, London 1967, 4, (ignored or relegated to a footnote): it is the purpose of this paper to prove them right.

<sup>9</sup> We may take this statement literally or not at all: «our grandfathers.» It is the only reliable evidence for the interval between the two wars. Tyrtaeus was, of course, addressing warriors in their prime: «fellow soldiers, your grandfathers fought etc.» An average age of 35–45 should be expected; their grandfathers too would have been of about the same age. N. G. L. HAMMOND, *Studies*, Oxford 1973, 96, n. 6, when summarizing the meaning of this datum, is being unreasonable.

<sup>10</sup> N. b.: this is not the interval. Justin 3, 5, 2, gives eighty years as the interval, obviously too improbably long generations of forty years.

<sup>11</sup> (Tyrtaeus, fr. 5 WEST, gives the duration of the first war as twenty years.) These dates are adjustable within certain boundaries, as neither the interval between the wars nor the beginning of the second is firmly specified: NIESE, l. c. (n. 8), prefers 710–690 and 630–600; LENSCHAU, l. c. (n. 8), dates the first war to ca. 660 and the second to ca. 600; JONES, l. c. (n. 8), prefers 690–670 and 620–600.

<sup>12</sup> Another chronology, more easily reconcilable with the low, was apparently known in antiquity: the second war began in ca. 640. Eusebius in the *Armenian Canon* says the second war began in 636, while Jerome has 637. According to Suidas, s. v. ΤΥΡΤΑΙΟΣ, Tyrtaeus flour-

Does any independent evidence speak for Pausanias' dates? There are arguments which we shall test. The List of Olympic Victors provides us with the names of seven Messenian victors from 768 to 736: Androclus (768) no. 3, Polychares (764) no. 4, Daicles (752) no. 7, Anticles (748) no. 8, Xenodocus or Xenocles (744) no. 9, Dotades (740) no. 10, and Leochares (736) no. 11.<sup>13</sup> The run stops with Leochares. Does this prove that the Messenian state was embroiled in war in 736? The inference is not cogent. FRANZ KIECHLE is the last who has argued that it is.<sup>14</sup> We look at a list of Wimbledon Men's Singles Champions and notice that no Englishman has won since FRED PERRY. What does this mean? Mr. KIECHLE can tell us. It means England has not existed since 1936. It was apparently conquered in the great war which followed. We then notice that no Frenchman has won since HENRI COCHET, RENÉ LACOSTE, and JEAN BOROTRA between them won six times in the nineteen-twenties. France apparently has not existed since then either. A far more natural inference is that English and French tennis players have not met with much success since those years. The Olympic Victor list shows little more. Corinth and Megara had begun competing in the games: Diocles (no. 13) and Dasmon (no. 14) won the footrace for Corinth in 728 and 724 respectively. The unorthodox Orrhippos or Orsippus (no. 16) returned triumphant to Megara in 720. Is it too difficult to believe that Messenian athletes were simply outrun by better ones? that with more states participating competition became fiercer? In the Olympic competitions of today it is not unknown for one country to dominate a particular event for several competitions (e. g. Japan and men's gymnastics) only to become second or third best in the following decades. For all we know Messenian athletes after a string of successes met with a string of heartbreakers and bad luck. The Olympic Victor List proves nothing. Supposing that the presidents of the games did not recognize exiles in the competitions, we may at least conclude that Messenia was still independent in 736. That may afford a *terminus post quem* for the end of the First Messenian War.

---

ished in 640–637; Jerome gives 636–633. JACOBY, *Apollodors Chronik*, 132, guessed that Sosibius was responsible for these dates also. The guess is, as far as I can see, incapable of proof. At any rate, why does Pausanias, who is presumed to be following Sosibius (see n. 2), not use these «Sosibian» dates? Moreover, it hardly seems clear that the same person is responsible for both «Sosibian» dates: Dating the Second Messenian War to ca. 640–620 might presuppose a lower date for the First Messenian War (say, 720–700) than the 740–720 attributed (with some plausibility) to Sosibius.

<sup>13</sup> Numbers refer to the list compiled by L. MORETTI, *Olympionikai: i vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*, Roma 1957.

<sup>14</sup> F. KIECHLE, *Messenische Studien*, Diss. Erlangen 1957, 9–14. KIECHLE maintained this view in a review in *Gnomon* 35, 1963, 370. Others: W. G. FORREST, *Sparta*, London 1980, 35; HUXLEY, *I. c.* (n. 8), 34; G. DICKINS, *The Growth of Spartan Foreign Policy*, *JHS* 32, 1912, 10–11. 15; HAMMOND, *CAH III*<sup>3</sup>, 324; J. KROYMANN, *Sparta und Messenien*, Berlin 1937, XIII–XV; P. OLIVA, *Sparta and her Social Problems*, Prague 1971, 106; L. H. JEFFERY, *Archaic Greece*, London 1976, 115.

The first Spartan victor is Acanthus (no. 17 in the Dolichus) in 720. Mr. KIECHLE suggests this signifies Sparta's victory. Why should a Spartan win immediately after the first war? Why could he not have run during the war? We know of one Messenian who ran during the second war (according to Pausanias): Phanas no. 31.<sup>15</sup>

Phanas won in the Dolichus (hence in 716 or later). According to Pausanias he was killed in the third year of the second war: Fact or fiction? Following the argument to its conclusion: provided that the presidents of the games did not recognize exiles, Phanas can only have won during the brief period of Messenian independence during the second war. This shows how little the list proves: if a Messenian could win during the second war, then a Messenian could win during the first war: hence the war could have begun in 756 at the earliest. There is no need to assume it began in 736, after the last Messenian victory. Let us assume that the name Phanas is correct: the rest of Pausanias' information about him derives from the pseudo-history of Messenia. We have now saved orthodoxy: there is no need to assume that Phanas ran during the second war and no need to assume that Daicles, Anticles, Xenodocus, Dotades, and Leochares ran while the first war raged. Problem: Phanas competed after 720 (the year in which the Dolichus was introduced). That is inconveniently late for Mr. KIECHLE. Phanas shows that Spartan and Messenian victors could have competed during the first Messenian war. Either that, or he proves that Messenia was still independent in 716 or later. Either the victor list is shown to be useless, or Messenia was independent as late as 716. One more attempt to save orthodoxy: let us assume that Phanas was allowed to compete as an exile. Why not then Leochares and his predecessors? Orthodoxy is again imperiled. Enough. The list has no value for us. It probably shows that Messenia was independent in 736 and possibly some years later when Phanas won. That is all.<sup>16</sup>

The founding of Taras in the last decade of the eighth century has on occasion been adduced as a *terminus ante quem* for the First Messenian War.<sup>17</sup> No one denies that Spartans founded it.<sup>18</sup> The stories which were told of the colony cause

<sup>15</sup> Pausanias 4, 17, 9.

<sup>16</sup> It is at any rate incorrect to speak of Hippias of Elis, who compiled the list of Olympic victors, of knowingly dating the war: no one ever dated the First Messenian War to 736–716. Nor did anyone realize that Hippias had «dated» the First Messenian War before O. MÜLLER, *Die Dorier I*, 146, n. 1, discovered it in 1824.

<sup>17</sup> The archaeological evidence indicates that Taras was founded in ca. 700 – see J. N. COLDSTREAM, *Geometric Greece*, London 1977, 239. For what it is worth Eusebius (*Jerome*) gives the date 706.

<sup>18</sup> The fullest accounts are found in Antiochus of Syracuse, FGrH 555, fr. 13, and Ephorus, FGrH 70, fr. 216. Both these accounts (discussed below) are quoted by Strabo 6, 3, 2–3, Pp. 278–280. Aristotle, *Politics* 1306b, 29–31, briefly mentions the colony and the circumstances which led to its founding. Polybius 8, 33, 9, merely notes that Taras was a Spartan colony. Diodorus 8, 21, (discussed below) is quite confused as to which group of Spartans

the problems. Some allege that the colony was founded by the illegitimate sons born to Spartan women during the First Messenian War. Hence a terminus ante quem for the first war. Let us investigate the stories more closely.

Aristotle mentions only the detail of a plot of the *Partheniae* («sons of virgins»), who in the defused plot's aftermath were sent out to found Taras. Ephorus and Antiochus give a fuller story. The Spartans (the Messenians having violated sundry Lacedaemonian maidens) swore never to return to Sparta until they had defeated the Messenians – both Antiochus and Ephorus. In their husbands' absence their wives contented themselves with Helots;<sup>19</sup> the sons of these unions were called *Partheniae* and naturally not recognized. Thus Antiochus; Ephorus allowed himself, however, to improve upon the tale: After ten hard years of war the Spartan women sent an embassy to point out that the country would soon be bereft of menfolk, as men were continually being killed in the war, but none were being born.<sup>20</sup> The Spartans, mindful of their oath, sent the younger men (who had not sworn) home in order to effect new citizens. Nevertheless, when the men came home from the war, they refused to recognize as citizens these sons, whom they called *Partheniae*. Both writers then agree: Afterwards, there was a conspiracy among the discontented *Partheniae*, but the Spartans got wind of it. In the end, however, cooler heads prevailed and the *Partheniae* were sent out to Taras. Others stories were told,<sup>21</sup> but Antiochus' and Ephorus' shall concern us here.

If we unconditionally accept this story, it means that the First Messenian War took place ca. 740–720. Nonetheless, problems abound. The story strains all credulity. Firstly, *partheniae* must mean «sons of maidens» or «sons of unmarried women»<sup>22</sup> and not «illegitimate sons of married women» or (LSJ) «sons of concubines.» A false etymological fable could lurk behind the story.<sup>23</sup> But *Partheniae* rings false. Secondly, it does not seem likely that the Spartans stayed in the field all the year round. It would be unparalleled in Greek history (the ten years at Troy notwithstanding). They really must have come home during the winter. The detail of the ten years is surely invented. Thirdly, why did the Spartans (accord-

---

actually founded the colony. Justin 3, 4, basically follows Ephorus' account with some abridgements. Pausanias 10, 10, 6–8, is only concerned with the oracle which led the founder, Phalanthus, to the site of the future city. Servius, ad Aeneidem 3, 551, and ad Georgica 4, 125, gives extremely muddled accounts, though he does call Taras a Spartan foundation.

<sup>19</sup> Surely an absurdity.

<sup>20</sup> Justin (n. 18) lets the men reach this conclusion without a feminine reminder.

<sup>21</sup> Pausanias (n. 18) tells a quaint story of the founder grappling with a baffling oracle: he should found a city, where rain fell from a clear sky. The oracle was fulfilled when his wife (Aethra) wept and her tears fell upon him. Orosius 1, 21, 3–5, follows Ephorus' version (n. 18).

<sup>22</sup> Perhaps a derivation from ὁ παρθένος: «unmarried man.»

<sup>23</sup> Resembling one of Plutarch's Greek Questions: «Who were the *Partheniae*? They were the illegitimate offspring of Spartan wives during the First Messenian War, for after ten years of war ...»

ing to Ephorus) refuse to recognize as citizens those whom they themselves had wished to be born? The entire purpose of sending the younger warriors back had been to provide Sparta with new citizens. This part of the story makes no sense at all. Fourthly, the connection with the Messenian War seems a priori false: after a long war (in which surely many losses had been incurred) one would not have the manpower resources available to found colonies. This argument becomes all the more cogent with respect to Sparta: if Sparta had just won the Messenian War, then surely there was land enough.<sup>24</sup>

Many elements of this story seem incoherent. Is the connection with the First Messenian War part and parcel of the pervasive silliness of sending men home to produce offspring and then not recognizing the offspring thus produced? or of oaths (convenient for the fabulist, who might be asked, «Why didn't the Spartans go home for the winter as all other citizen armies in Greece?») which prevent the normal production of offspring thus causing the dire situation of declining birth rates? One must remember that similar stories were spun out of the Spartans' presumed absence during the first war. For example, whilst the kings were away, ephors were appointed to run the state in their absence.<sup>25</sup> Curiously, Tyrtaeus, who gives a fair summary of the Spartan constitution in the time of the second war, knows nothing of them.<sup>26</sup> A possible suggestion: someone tried to account for the *Partheniae* in a similar way. They, too, were a by-product of the Spartans' prolonged absence. In the earlier version of Antiochus they were the offspring of Helots and Spartan wives. To later authors, such as Ephorus, to whom such cuckoldry was apparently repulsive not to mention unbelievable, they were the product of an officially sanctioned attempt to produce more citizens. If thus sanctioned, why then denied citizenship? Amelioration gives birth to further contradiction. The entire story of the *Partheniae* is a farrago of nonsense.

We may here refer to a similar account of Theopompus,<sup>27</sup> who states that there was a manpower shortage in Sparta – after the First Messenian War. To boost birth rates the Spartans assigned Helots to the widows of fallen warriors. These Helots were eventually freed and called *Epeunactoi*.<sup>28</sup> Diodorus<sup>29</sup> confuses the *Partheniae* with the *Epeunactoi*, further highlighting the unreliability of the stories about the *Partheniae*.

To make a guess at who the *Partheniae* may have been: They were neither

<sup>24</sup> It is, of course, possible that factional difficulties forced the emigration of the *Partheniae*. This does not, however, necessitate that the *Partheniae* were born during the First Messenian War.

<sup>25</sup> Plutarch, Cleomenes 10. It is of no concern to us here, when and how the ephorate did arise: suffice it to say that no one believes that the ephorate came into being in this fashion.

<sup>26</sup> Tyrtaeus, fr. 4 WEST.

<sup>27</sup> Theopompus, FGrH 115, fr. 171 = Athenaeus 6, p. 271 cd.

<sup>28</sup> The story is little more than an etymological guess based on the word ἐπεύνακτοι.

<sup>29</sup> See n. 18. Diodorus writes ἐπεύνακταί. Cf. Hesychius, s. v. ἐπεύνακτοί.

Spartiates nor Perioeci nor Helots, that is clear. It may be an anachronism to speak at this early date of Spartans who had lost their lots. The easiest way to attain Laconians who were neither Spartiates nor Helots nor Perioeci is surely illicit relations between Spartan males and Helot and Perioecic women, not the illicit relations of Spartan women with others. This is, in fact, what Aristotle explicitly says: ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων γὰρ ἦσαν (Politics 1306b 30). «They were the sons of Equals.» The implication must surely be that they were entitled to citizenship on their fathers' side but not on their mothers'. It is no good denying Aristotle's statement by appealing to a confused and improbable report in Antiochus (they were sons of Helots) and a sanitized and illogical one in Ephorus. The *Partheniae* were sons of Spartiates; this absolutely precludes their having sprung from unions in the Spartiates' absence during the First Messenian War.<sup>30</sup> Thus vanishes the hook from which the connection between the *Partheniae* and the war depended.

This said, it does not seem necessary to take the story of the founding of Taras as serious evidence for the date of the First Messenian War. We should accept Taras as a Spartan foundation in the very late eighth century, probably resulting from disturbances caused by a deprived faction nicknamed, for reasons unknown to us, «maidens' sons.»<sup>31</sup>

The best evidence for the high chronology of the Messenian Wars (and hence the least often adduced) is a section from the famous «Embassy to Achilles» passage in the Iliad. In order to persuade Achilles to rejoin the fight against the Trojans, Agamemnon offers to give him seven cities:

ἑπτὰ δὲ οἱ δώσω εὖ ναίόμενα πολιεθρα,  
 Καρδαμύλην Ἐνόπην τε καὶ Ἴριην ποιήεσσαν,  
 Φηρέας τε ζαθέας ἠδ' Ἄνθειαν βαθύλειμον,  
 καλήν τ' Αἴπειαν καὶ Πήδασον ἀμπελόεσσαν.  
 πᾶσαι δ' ἐγγυὸς ἀλόε, νέεται Πύλου ἡμαθόεντος.<sup>32</sup>

«I will give him seven well-inhabited cities,  
 Cardamyle, Enope, and grassy Hira,

<sup>30</sup> Unless we wish to believe Ephorus' oxymoronic alterations to Antiochus' story.

<sup>31</sup> There are hints that the *Partheniae* may have come primarily from Amyclae, a town which is generally held to have had a pre-Dorian population (so e. g. Pausanias 3, 2, 6). The failed plot (according to Antiochus – see note 18) was to have taken place in Amyclae at the Hyacinthia, a pre-Dorian festival. This Amyclaeian cult is attested at Taras – Polybius 8, 28, 2. The oecist of Taras bore a pre-Dorian (indeed pre-Greek) name, Phalanthus (e. g. Antiochus or Ephorus – see note 18). See HUXLEY, l. c. (n. 8), 37, with notes. Contra see KIECHLE, Lakonien und Sparta, München 1963, 176–178, who remains quite skeptical. If the *Partheniae* were Amyclaeans – which is hardly certain – then the colonization of Taras may have been an aftereffect of the annexation of Amyclae (certain Amyclaeans were for various reasons not granted full Spartan citizenship); the colonization of Taras could then have taken place before the First Messenian War shortly after the annexation of Amyclae.

<sup>32</sup> Iliad 9, 150–153.292–295. (For now I follow MONRO and ALLEN's Oxford edition.)



Sacred Pherae and deep-meadowed Antheia,  
 Fair Aepeia and vine-clad Pegasus.  
 All are near the sea and border<sup>33</sup> sandy Pylos.»

This shows that Sparta was presumed to hold these cities in about the late eighth century.<sup>34</sup> Three of these cities, Antheia, Aepeia, and Pegasus, are otherwise unknown; nor did anyone in classical times have any real idea where they lay. Strabo and his sources had the same clues which we have:<sup>35</sup> they were near the sea on the borders of Pylos. Enope and Cardamyle lay on the eastern side of the Messenian Gulf, west of Mt. Taygetus. Pherae lay at the head of the gulf near the mouth of the River Nedon. The only known Hira is an inland town in Messenia, close to the borders of Elis and Arcadia. Because of the clear geographical indication *πᾶσαι δ' ἔγγυς ἄλός* this is unacceptable. There may have been another likewise named town in about the same region as the known three.<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, KIECHLE's reinterpretation of the orthography of the passage seems to me certain: instead of Ἱρῆν ποιήεσσαν read Ἱρῆν Ποιήεσσαν.<sup>37</sup> «Holy Poëäessa» (see below) was in the correct region. The unknown three are probably in about the same region – on the shores of the Messenian Gulf.

<sup>33</sup> Νέατος must mean «bordering on sandy Pylos» rather than, as at Iliad 11, 711–712 (Θυόεσσα πόλις . . . νεάτη Πύλου ἡμαθέντος), «Thryoessa, the farthest city of sandy Pylos.» Agamemnon, to be able to give the cities away, must have them under his control: they cannot belong to Nestor. If they do belong to Nestor, then Agamemnon is purposely insulting Achilles by offering him cities that he has no ability to give. Nothing in the scene suggests such an insult.

<sup>34</sup> R. HOPE SIMPSON, Identifying a Mycenaean State, *ABSA* 52, 1957, 231–259, and: The Seven Cities offered by Agamemnon to Achilles, *ABSA* 61, 1966, 113–131, considers the indicated date to be the thirteenth century. He appeals to the passage's similarity to the «Catalogue of Ships,» which he feels reflects Mycenaean conditions (SIMPSON and LAZENBY, *The Catalogue of Ships in Homer's Iliad*, Oxford 1970, *passim*). However we date that list, there is no real reason to date our passage by means of the «Catalogue.» Nor is there any reason to assume (as e. g. H. T. WADE-GERY, *The Poet of the Iliad*, Cambridge 1952, 56 and 86, n. 116, and V. BURR, ΝΕΩΝ ΚΑΤΑΛΟΓΟΣ, Leipzig 1944, 60–61, do) that our passage actually was transferred from the «Catalogue»; the proposal is rightly rejected by SIMPSON himself, *ABSA* 1966, 129. In the absence of contrary evidence we should assume that Homer is describing the conditions of his own day, e. g. the late eighth century, as the passage shows no signs of being younger. The onus probandi falls on those who feel otherwise.

<sup>35</sup> Strabo's sources suggest various cities (Thuria, Corone, Methone, and Asine) on the western shore of the Messenian Gulf in differing combinations for these three cities. We should have no compunction in disbelieving them: they too had only this passage in the Iliad to go on. Strabo 8, 4, 1–5, Pp. 358–360; Pausanias 4, 35, 1 and 4, 36, 3. Some of the cities may in fact have lain on the western shore of the Messenian Gulf; we simply have no reliable evidence as to where they were located.

<sup>36</sup> As SIMPSON, *ABSA* 52, 1957, 252, suggests, following Pausanias 4, 30, 1, who places it in the region around Abia.

<sup>37</sup> KIECHLE, Pylos und der pylische Raum in der antiken Tradition, *Historia* 9, 1960, 62, n. 2.

This is, of course, not the same region in which the First Messenian War took place. The term «Messene», «the Middle Country», originally referred to the plain of the upper Pamisus, the lands about Mt. Ithome.<sup>38</sup> Euripides in the fifth century could still describe Messenia as *πρόσω ναυτίλοισιν* (inaccessible to ships).<sup>39</sup> This description cannot possibly refer to the classical polis, though it describes the plain of the upper Pamisus quite nicely. We know, furthermore, that the town of Corone on the Messenian Gulf was not considered to belong to Messenia in 732, since Oxythemis, the winner in the twelfth olympiad, is described as a Coronean and not as a Messenian.<sup>40</sup> It is clear, then, that the «seven cities» passage cannot refer to the First Messenian War, which took place in the region around Mt. Ithome.<sup>41</sup>

Fortunately, we have independent evidence, which most satisfactorily explains the Spartan control of the «seven cities» region: *παρὰ δὲ Φηραῶν Νέδων ἐκβάλλει, ῥέων διὰ τῆς Λακωνικῆς, ἔτερος ὢν τῆς Νέδας· ἔχει δ' ἱερὸν ἐπίσημον τῆς Ἀθηναῶν Νεδουσίας (καὶ ἐν Ποιαέσσει δ' ἐστὶν Ἀθηναῶν Νεδουσίας ἱερὸν, ἐπώνυμον τόπου τινὸς Νέδοντος), ἐξ οὗ φασὶν οἰκίσαι Τήλεκλον Ποιαέσσαν καὶ Ἐχειᾶς καὶ Τράγιον.*<sup>42</sup> «Near Pherae the River Nedon debouches, flowing through Laconia, being, in fact, a different river from the Neda. Pherae has a remarkable temple of Athena Nedousia (there is a temple of Athena Nedousia in Poeäessa also, named for some place called Nedon); they say that from this place Teleclus founded Poeäessa, Echeia, and Tragium.»

Teleclus was the grandfather of Polydorus, the colleague of the conqueror of Messenia, King Theopompus. Pausanias also mentions that Teleclus conquered

<sup>38</sup> See KIECHLE, *Messenische Studien*, 53–56.

<sup>39</sup> Strabo 8, 5, 6, p. 366.

<sup>40</sup> MORETTI, l. c. (n. 13), no. 12. One must admit, however, that the ethnic in Africanus' list (KARST, p. 91) could possibly be wrong, as Philostratus, *Gymnasticus* p. 267, ed. KAYSER, states that there were three Eleans, seven Messenians, one Corinthian, one Dymeian, and one Cleonaeian among the first thirteen victors. Cleonae is in the Argolis; it is, of course, possible that a town in this region sent a victor to Olympia this early, though the first certain winner out of the Argolis was Polus of Epidaurus in 712 (no. 19). At any rate U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Pindarus*, Berlin 1922, 482, n. 2, is probably right in holding Oxythemis to be a Coronean (despite MORETTI's objections, which seem to miss the point).

<sup>41</sup> Tyrtaeus, fr. 5 WEST.

<sup>42</sup> Strabo 8, 4, 4, p. 360, punctuation mine. The passage is, alas, vintage Strabo. There was no temple of Athena Nedousia in Pherae, although there was one in the town of, coincidentally, Poeäessa on Ceos. Strabo's comment on the other Temple of Athena Nedousia is clearly parenthetical; Teleclus did not conquer Ceos and found colonies from that island. Strabo has obviously gotten muddled over the River Nedon, Athena Nedousia, and Poeäessa. Having incorrectly placed the temple in Pherae, he vaguely remembers where the temple really is and inserts a parenthetical comment on the real temple on Ceos, but cannot remember why it is so called. He then mentions Teleclus' three towns, one of which has the same name as the Ceian town. The parentheses restore meaning to the sentence.

Pherae;<sup>43</sup> a late source, Nepos, calls it a Laconian colony.<sup>44</sup> We may conclude, that Pherae and the «seven cities» region was conquered by Teleclus at least a generation before the First Messenian War.

We have now examined the arguments for the high chronology: The Olympic Victor List proves nothing at all. The founding of Taras is hardly to be connected with the First Messenian War. The «seven cities» passage of the Iliad is evidence of other conquests a generation or so before the First Messenian War.

Having bereft the high chronology of its principal supports, we should ask, Does anything back the low? Pausanias' sources are tendentious. Plutarch's seem good. Epaminondas with dry and justly famous wit defended himself against a capital charge: the incident is likely to have been remembered and written down. Who told Epaminondas that it had been 230 years? Most likely the Messenians.<sup>45</sup> The Spartans seem unlikely candidates. The Messenians are quite likely to have remembered when Sparta drove them out; for generations they had counted the days and years till their land should be restored to them.<sup>46</sup> Why should we

<sup>43</sup> Pausanias 3, 2, 6. It is not clear, however, which Pherae Pausanias means. There was a Laconian Pherae (Strabo 8, 5, 1, p. 363; Pausanias 4, 16, 8), and Pausanias may be referring to it. The same applies to the Pharis (= Pherae) in the Catalogue of Ships (Iliad 2, 582).

<sup>44</sup> Nepos, Conon 1, 1.

<sup>45</sup> KIECHLE, *Messenische Studien*, 11, 56, polemicizes against a «boiotisch-messenische» version, which is clearly inferior to the Spartan version – whatever that was. Isocrates, Archidamus 23, claims that the first Messenian War was fought shortly after the coming of the Heraclids in the eleventh or twelfth century. The date seems false. Isocrates, Archidamus 27, gives another: Sparta ruled Messenia for 400 years. Hence: First Messenian War ran from 790 to 770. Cf. Orosius, 1, 21, 3, who dates the Spartan conquest to 774. As Orosius seems to have taken his account from Ephorus (see n. 21), Ephorus may be the source of Isocrates' assertion at Archidamus 27. Lycurgus, in Leocratem 62, claims that Sparta ruled Messenia for 500 years. To combat these self-evident truths the Messenians were in cahoots with the Boeotians to spread an evil lie: the Spartans had ruled Messenia for a mere 230 years since the end of the second war – as if that were more palatable to Messenian pride.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. the ardent Polish patriot, APOLLO KORZENIOWSKI (JOSEPH CONRAD's father), who wrote a poem to commemorate his son's birth: «To my Son Born in the eighty-fifth Year of the Muscovite Oppression.»

There were undoubtedly Messenians in the West – the Messenians who fled their lands had to go somewhere, as even Arcadia was soon forbidden them, as the treaty between Sparta and Tegea (Aristotle, fr. 592 ROSE = Plutarch, mor. p. 292) shows. There was a means of marking the passage of time in the West, since Thucydides was able to give accurate dates for the foundations in that region (COLDSTREAM, *Greek Geometric Pottery*, 302–327). All we have to postulate is that some Messenians thought about their homeland, as exiles, indeed all emigrants, are wont to do. Messenians in the West obviously retained interest in affairs in their homeland – the first and second generations certainly dreamed of returning home one day and marked the years of their exile against that day. Epaminondas brought Messenians from all regions to refound Messenia – some patriots from the West most certainly joined in the refoundation of their native land. It is they who would have informed Epaminondas of how long it had been since their forefathers were exiled.

wish to contradict them?<sup>47</sup> Let this suffice for *prima facie* comparison of the sources.

We now turn to positive evidence. First of all, Tyrtaeus. He rallied the Spartans to defeat Messenia in the second war; it is worthwhile to ask when he wrote. Sir KENNETH'S DOVER<sup>48</sup> has examined the relationship of Tyrtaeus to Archilochus<sup>49</sup> and Callinus,<sup>50</sup> both of whom flourished in the middle of the seventh century. Sir KENNETH'S conclusion is illuminating: based on his study of vocabulary,<sup>51</sup> Tyrtaeus' non-observance of the digamma,<sup>52</sup> and the hortatory character of Tyrtaeus' poetry<sup>53</sup> he avows that Tyrtaeus wrote later than the two Ionians. Suidas, s. v. Τυρταῖος (for what it is worth) gives the 35th Olympiad (640–637) for Tyrtaeus' acme. Jerome gives the 36th Olympiad (636–633). Hence Sir KENNETH could write: «I see no reason to date any poem earlier than 640.»<sup>54</sup> Tyrtaeus writes decades after the Second Messenian War, if we believe in Pausanias and the high chronology. Pausanias is wrong. Tyrtaeus lodges the Second Messenian War firmly in the second half of the seventh century, unless we wish to propose higher dates for Archilochus, Callinus, Gyges, and the Assyrian inscriptions of Assurbanipal. This really should be decisive in demolishing Pausanias and the high chronology, but there is even more evidence to be arrayed.

Pausanias' sources, for example. They are Myron of Priene for the first war and Rhianus of Crete for the second. As Mr. PEARSON has shown, Myron is useless. Rhianus on the other hand may have used Callisthenes,<sup>55</sup> whom we may grant some trust. Not much, but enough to ask what Rhianus' dates were. Pausa-

---

<sup>47</sup> FORREST, *Sparta*, 69, makes the infelicitous suggestion, that the figure of 230 years has been spun out of a confusion of two Spartan kings, Laotychidas I and his likewise named great-great-grandson. To anticipate later points: Pausanias (and no one before him) mistook Rhianus' reference to a King Laotychidas. Pausanias' (incorrect) genealogy of Spartan kings included only one such king, whose reign began in 491. There was no such confusion before Pausanias. Nor was there any Messenian War in 490.

<sup>48</sup> Sir KENNETH J. DOVER, *The Poetry of Archilochos*, *Fondation Hardt* 10, 183–212, esp. 190–195.

<sup>49</sup> See JACOBY, *The Date of Archilochus*, *CQ* 35, 1941, 97–109; JACOBY dates Archilochus to 680–640. It may as well be pointed out, that JACOBY gives an incorrect date for the death of Gyges – see next note.

<sup>50</sup> Callinus is dated by his reference to the sack of Sardis by the Cimmerians in ca. 650: Callinus, fr. 5 WEST = Strabo 14, 1, 40, p. 648. The sack of Sardis is dated by the death of Gyges; for this see now M. COGAN and H. TADMOR, *Gyges and Ashurbanipal: A Study in literary Transmission*, *Orientalia* 46, 1977, 84.

<sup>51</sup> DOVER, l. c. (n. 48), 190–191: Tyrtaeus' language is the Ionic vernacular.

<sup>52</sup> DOVER, l. c. (n. 48), 191–193.

<sup>53</sup> DOVER, l. c. (n. 48), 193–194: this evinces a development from certain poems of Archilochus and Callinus.

<sup>54</sup> DOVER, l. c. (n. 48), 193, n. 2.

<sup>55</sup> PEARSON, l. c. (n. 1), 405, 409, 417–418.

nias himself tells us, for Rhianus' date has disturbed him.<sup>56</sup> King Laotychidas, Rhianus said, commanded in the Second Messenian War. We know two kings<sup>57</sup> of that name, though Pausanias knew but one.<sup>58</sup> It is patently ridiculous to maintain that the Second Messenian War was fought after 491, the year in which Cleomenes secured the second Laotychidas' accession.<sup>59</sup> His great-great-grandfather also bore the name Laotychidas. Dates based on counting kings' reigns lead at best to vague results. As we have nothing better, we may as well guess ca. 615 for the accession of Laotychidas I.<sup>60</sup> If this king did command in the Second Messenian War the low chronology is much to be preferred, although the date of the accession of Laotychidas I may itself have to be adjusted (this is the bane of dating by reigns or generations).

For what it is worth, Theopompus is four reigns above Laotychidas I: hence ca. 715 for his accession.<sup>61</sup> Given the problems of dating by reigns, we may as well concede that on the basis of Rhianus the Second Messenian War took place toward the end of the seventh century, while the first war took place around 700 or a little earlier.

As far as the Agiad line goes, we get similar results. Polydorus was Theopom-

<sup>56</sup> Pausanias 4, 15, 1 = Rhianus, FGrH 265, fr. 43.

<sup>57</sup> Herodotus 8, 131; whose genealogy, incidentally, has been confirmed by POxy 2390, fr. 2, col. II, Ll. 17–22. (Alcman seems to have mentioned a king Laotychidas, about whom the commentator affixes some remarks.)

<sup>58</sup> Pausanias 3, 1, 7.

<sup>59</sup> Herodotus 6, 67. Laotychidas' father and grandfather were not kings (Hdt. 8, 131 – n. B. ignore PAULMIER's emendation). Relations are being given as in the list.

<sup>60</sup> BURN, l. c. (n. 7), 131, gives figures for the Spartan kings in the historical era: an average generation is thirty-one years but an average reign is twenty-five. In historical times brother did succeed brother in Sparta; only before historical times, if we believe the list, was the succession a neat, unbroken line of sons succeeding fathers. This is surely false; we have no right to assume that what did happen in historical times did not happen prior to them, especially since it runs counter to all reason to assume that each king, generation after generation, produced a suitable heir and that no king ever fell victim to the machinations of his colleague or his relatives. (N. b. series of names such as «Eurycratides son of Anaxander son of Eurycrates» – Herodotus 7, 204. Grandsons are commonly named after grandfathers, but the name «Son of Eurycrates» for the grandson of Eurycrates seems odd. If the literal meaning of the name is correct, then Eurycratides and Anaxander were brothers.) BURN's figure of twenty-five years per reign, then, is the best we have to go on.

Laotychidas I was the fifth king before Laotychidas II, who was the fourth descendant of Laotychidas I. There are, then, two ways to arrive at the date of Laotychidas' accession. We may count reigns:  $491 + (25 \times 5) = 616$ . We may count generations:  $491 + (31 \times 4) = 615$ .

<sup>61</sup> BELOCH, l. c. (n. 8), 183, improbably dated Theopompus to the second half of the eighth century and used this to date the First Messenian War. He is followed by L. PARETI, *Storia di Sparta archaica I*, Firenze 1920, 208, and apparently by E. CAVAIGNAC, *Sparta*, Paris 1948, 11–12, though without notes or arguments. CAVAIGNAC states that the first war occurred «aux approches de l'an 700» and that the second war took place at the «fin du VII<sup>e</sup> siècle.»

pus' colleague toward the end of the latter's reign.<sup>62</sup> Therefore Polydorus' father should have been Theopompus' colleague during most of the First Messenian War. Polydorus' father was Alcamenes, who is eight reigns earlier than Leonidas.<sup>63</sup> Simple calculation yields a result of ca. 690<sup>64</sup> for the accession of Alcamenes. Since Alcamenes became king around 690, we may probably assume that the First Messenian War took place in early seventh century. We do not know which Agiad(s) was (were) king(s) during the second war,<sup>65</sup> so we can propose no date. But the kinglists cry out for the low chronology.<sup>66</sup>

Other genealogical evidence indicates a low dating of the Messenian Wars. The early fifth century tyrant of Rhegium, Anaxilas, was the third descendant of Alcidas, a refugee from the second war. Anaxilas died in 476 – his great-grandfather should have been born in ca. 635.<sup>67</sup> If we assume that Anaxilas' great-grandfather was in his early thirties or so when he emigrated, then the Second Messenian War should have been fought in the last decades of the seventh century. One may, of course, challenge the authenticity of the genealogy. Yet it does have the ring of truth about it. The exiles in the West, as I have already suggested, seem to have counted the years and the generations. I do not find it inconceivable that Anaxilas knew that his great-grandfather had come over from Messenia after the second war. If the proposition that the exiles in the West, some of whom almost certainly joined in the refounding of Messenia, gave Epaminondas the figure of 230 years, in any way comes near to the truth, then this proposition and the genealogy of Anaxilas mutually reinforce each other.

A final word may be said now about the 230 years of Messenian subjection. It is possible that this figure too derives from genealogy. If certain exiles (such as Anaxilas) had kept track of their genealogies, then Epaminondas' figure could

<sup>62</sup> Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 6. The fact that Polydorus is two generations later than Theopompus compels the inference that the two were colleagues toward the end of Theopompus' reign.

<sup>63</sup> Herodotus 7, 204. (N. b. Leonidas' immediate predecessor was Cleomenes.)

<sup>64</sup> Leonidas became king shortly after Demaratus' demise in 491. Herodotus 6, 74–75, tells the tale of Cleomenes' madness and suicide.

<sup>65</sup> Pausanias 3, 3, 4, says Anaxander, but this means little and is probably Pausanias' guess.

<sup>66</sup> In order to bring Theopompus up to ca. 740 we must postulate an average reign of about 35 years per king. In the Agiad house it is slightly easier: we must postulate an average reign of about 31 years. Nevertheless, twenty-five years seems the safest guess for an average reign (see n. 60).

<sup>67</sup> Pausanias 4, 23, 6. Let us assume that Anaxilas became tyrant when he was about 40. He ruled for 18 years and would have died in his late fifties. We cannot let him be too old, since his children were still minors when he died (Diodorus 11, 48). Thus:  $476 + 58 + (33\frac{1}{2} \times 3) = 634$ . Since this is not a royal genealogy, we should expect slightly longer generations – kings and would-be kings put a premium on producing an heir. Herodotus 2, 142, 2, assumed that 3 generations were roughly equal to a century; I follow him and for purposes of calculation let one generation equal  $33\frac{1}{2}$  years.

reflect seven generations of exile:  $(33\frac{1}{3} \times 7)$  rounded down.<sup>68</sup> In this case we need not expect the figure to be exact; as with the genealogies of Spartan kings and others, this figure could admit of some adjusting up or down.

There is one farther genealogy to consider. The great-grandson of the daughter of Aristomenes, the Messenian hero of the second war, won at Olympia as a boxer in 464.<sup>69</sup> Aristomenes is said to have had three daughters; the one whom Diagoras' great-grandfather (Damagetus) married was the third. According to the story Aristomenes wedded her to Damagetus after the Second Messenian War. Let us assume that Diagoras was thirty or so in 464. His great-grandmother should have been born in ca. 575.<sup>70</sup> Aristomenes may have been fairly old when his third daughter was born, so he himself may have been born in ca. 620 or so. If this is correct, it would require a very low date for the Second Messenian War. Pausanias, however, further notes that Aristomenes wished to journey to the courts of Ardys of Lydia and Phraortes of Media. Ardys became king in ca. 650, but we have little idea of how long he reigned. Traditionally he reigned about forty or fifty years.<sup>71</sup> Phraortes became king of Media in about 674 and reigned for 22 years.<sup>72</sup> The true dates conflict, but Pausanias was most likely using either the Herodotean dates, 678–629<sup>73</sup> and 684–662<sup>74</sup> respectively, or the corresponding Apollodoran dates, 663–625<sup>75</sup> and 654–630<sup>76</sup> respectively. The marriage then would have occurred in the second or third quarter of the seventh century. This is, of course, impossible with the genealogy given. Aristomenes' travel plans are clearly fictitious; little trust can be placed in the implied chronology, especially

<sup>68</sup> W. DEN BOER, *Laconian Studies*, Amsterdam 1954, 14.

<sup>69</sup> Pausanias 4, 24, 3; 6, 7, 3; Scholiast to Pindar, Ol. 7 (to the dedication). Myron of Priene, FGrH 106, fr. 12 = Pausanias 4, 6, 4, put Aristomenes in the first war, though most others placed him in the second war: Diodorus 15, 66, 3; Polybius 4, 33, 5 (Ephorus may be the source of both Polybius and Diodorus); Rhianus, FGrH 215, fr. 38–46.

<sup>70</sup>  $464 + 30 + (33\frac{1}{3}) \times 2 + 15 = 576$ .

<sup>71</sup> Gyges, the father of Ardys, died in ca. 650 – see n. 50. Ardys reigned 49 years according to Herodotus 1, 16, 1. Of the chronographers Jerome, Syncellus, and Barbarus give him 38 years; the *Series Regum* says 48, while the Armenian Canon has 37.

<sup>72</sup> I. M. DIAKONOFF, *Media*, in: *Cambridge History of Iran*, 1985, vol. II, p. 110–113.

<sup>73</sup> Herodotus 1, 86, 1; 1, 25, 1; 1, 16, 1 (using 546 as the date of the fall of Sardis).

<sup>74</sup> See DIAKONOFF, l. c. (n. 72), for the internal Median chronology. Herodotus' date for the end of the Median kingdom is nine or ten years too high: Astyages fell in 550/549 in the sixth year of King Nabonidus of Babylon, A. K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, New York 1975, 107. Herodotus, however, dates the fall of Astyages to 559: Herodotus 1, 214, 3; 3, 66, 2. 67, 2; 7, 4.7.20, 1.

<sup>75</sup> Ardys reigns for 38 years (see n. 71), Sadyattes for 15 (Jerome, Syncellus, Barbarus, *Series Regum* – the 5 years given by the Armenian Canon are a *lapsus calami*), Alyattes for 49 (Jerome, Armenian Canon, Syncellus, Barbarus; the *Series Regum* incorrectly writes 45 years), and Croesus for 15 (all). Sardis fell in 546 according to Apollodorus.

<sup>76</sup> Jerome; the Armenian Canon has 653–629.

since it conflicts with the genealogy, which implies a much later date.<sup>77</sup> King Aristomenes of Messenia may be a figure of legend; certainly much legendary detail (such as the planned trip to Phraortes of Media) attached itself to his career. If the Diagorids of Rhodes invented the genealogy,<sup>78</sup> we would still have an early fifth century dating of the Messenian Wars. If the genealogy is real, it implies a very low date for these wars. If it is invented, it implies a low date, though we cannot tell how low, since we have no idea of how the Diagorids arranged the genealogy.<sup>79</sup> At the very least, people in the fifth century were by no means convinced of a high dating of the Messenian Wars.

We have other evidence: the founding of Rhegium. According to Strabo Messenians helped to settle this Chalcidian colony.<sup>80</sup> KIECHLE, grasping at straws, has suggested that these Messenians were refugees from the First Messenian War and that Rhegium was founded in 720.<sup>81</sup> This is a bit misleading.

That Rhegium was of Chalcidian origin is certain: Thucydides always calls it «Chalcidian.»<sup>82</sup> He does not say if Chalcis itself settled the site. Strabo,<sup>83</sup> using Antiochus as his source, says that the driving force behind the foundation was Zancle, Rhegium's counterpart on the other side of the strait. Chalcis and Zancle, itself founded by renegade Cumaeans and later refounded by Cumae and Chalcis,<sup>84</sup> together founded Rhegium. Delphi enters the picture. Diodorus<sup>85</sup> and Dionysius of Halicarnassus<sup>86</sup> speak of an oracle to the Chalcidians: they were to found a city where they saw a man and a woman entwined. (Answer: a vine and a wild fig-tree.) Heraclides Lembus<sup>87</sup> tells the same story, but with Messenians in addition to the Chalcidians. Strabo says that these Messenians (in addition to the main founders) were constrained to leave Messenia at the *beginning* of the con-

<sup>77</sup> In the course of its transmission to Pausanias the story of the Diagorids and Aristomenes will have acquired the adornment of a planned trip to Sardis and Ecbatana. That the adornment is later than the genealogy is shown by the fact that the reference to Ardys and Phraortes implies the high (Hellenistic) chronology.

<sup>78</sup> They might well have done so; it has always been advantageous for an up and coming family to acquire a famous ancestor.

<sup>79</sup> We do not know how long an average generation they used, nor do we know how old they considered Aristomenes to be at the time of the birth of his third daughter.

<sup>80</sup> Strabo 6, 1, 6, p. 257.

<sup>81</sup> KIECHLE, *Messenische Studien*, 13. His hypothesis (7–8), that these Messenians, bitterly ashamed to admit that Sparta had driven them out, transferred their anger and bitterness from their enemies, the Spartans, to their friends, the other Messenians, whom they accused of being the ones who drove them out for opposing an unjust war with the Spartan invader, need not be taken seriously.

<sup>82</sup> Thucydides 6, 44, 3; 6, 79, 2; cf. 3, 86, 2.

<sup>83</sup> Strabo 6, 1, 6, p. 257 = Antiochus, FGrH 555, fr. 13.

<sup>84</sup> Thucydides 6, 4, 5.

<sup>85</sup> Diodorus 8, fr. 23, 2.

<sup>86</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities* 19, 2.

<sup>87</sup> Heraclides Lembus, *De rebus publicis* 25 = Aristotle, fr. 611 no. 55, ROSE.



flict with Sparta. Pausanias<sup>88</sup> in albeit confused fashion reports that the Messenians after sundry misadventures after the *second* war were invited by the tyrant of an *already founded* Rhegium to immigrate.<sup>89</sup> KIECHLE has therefore no evidence when he says that the emigration took place at the end of the first war. That is his assumption. It does not proceed from the evidence.

Now the date of the founding. The archaeologists give us a solitary Oenochoe<sup>90</sup> of ca. 720<sup>91</sup> or ca. 700<sup>92</sup> that offers evidence of an eighth century foundation. A lone find does not a positive date make. Rhegium was obviously founded after Zancle, but no ancient author gives anything approaching a date. Zancle was probably founded a little after 728,<sup>93</sup> certainly before 717 or 716.<sup>94</sup> The Chalcidians and Cumaeans came some time after the first foundation. They could have come five or ten years later. Was Rhegium founded before or after the Chalcidians came to Zancle? Or at about the same time? For that matter, can we really be so certain that Rhegium was not founded in the same manner as Zancle itself? It seems the obvious procedure. Zancleans scouted the area, cleared it, and erected the first buildings. Then came the Chalcidian settlers. A year or two later? We do not know whether the Chalcidians came out in the same year as the Zancleans or some time thereafter, but we do know that Zancleans must have been at Rhegium first. Given the uncertain chronology of the settlement of Zancle itself, it is possible that the foundation of Rhegium is to be set somewhat later than 720. 700 is perfectly possible. Chalcidian settlers could have sailed to Zancle and Rhegium in the closing years of the century. The Messenians may have immigrated even later – though we are not told this. The story which Strabo tells is suspicious: the Messenians are tagged on as an afterthought. Granted he implies they sailed with the Chalcidians, but that could be just his assumption. Pausanias speaks of a Rhegian invitation to the Messenians, though his confusion vitiates any conclusion based on his story. We have seen that KIECHLE'S

<sup>88</sup> Pausanias 4, 23.

<sup>89</sup> Pausanias seems to think that this occurred during the reign of the tyrant Anaxilas of Rhegium. This is impossible as Anaxilas was tyrant at the beginning of the fifth century – two centuries after Rhegium's foundation. Nevertheless, Pausanias sees the whole affair as a direct consequence of the Second Messenian War, although Anaxilas is the fourth descendant of a refugee of that war. It is difficult to grant Pausanias' story any credibility. Still, see appendix I for another possibility.

<sup>90</sup> G. VALLET, *Rhegium et Zancle*, Paris 1958, 140.

<sup>91</sup> COLDSTREAM, *Geometric Greece*, 237.

<sup>92</sup> J. BOARDMAN, *The Greeks Overseas*, 171.

<sup>93</sup> Thucydides 6, 3–4, seems to put the foundation of Zancle after the foundation of Leontini and Catane in 728. Archaeological evidence (VALLET, l. c. [n. 90], 140; COLDSTREAM, *Geometric Greece*, 237) dates the founding to the 720's.

<sup>94</sup> The Zancleean Foundation of Mylae (= Chernessus according to the scholiast to Apollonius of Rhodes 4, 965) took place in 716 (Eusebius: *Armenian Canon*) or 717 (Eusebius: *Jerome*). See COLDSTREAM, *Geometric Greece*, 237, and *Greek Geometric Pottery*, 326, n. 4.

case is a good deal less certain than he imagines. The date is uncertain: 720 is the absolute earliest. 700 can work just as well: Zancle founded in 720; Chalcidians and Cumaeans refound the town in 710; post established at Rhegium in 715? 710? 705?; Chalcidians come to Rhegium in 710? 705? 700?; Messenians come with them? or later in 705? 700? 695? We do not know. There is no point in pressing for the earliest or the latest dates. Let us guess ca. 710 for the foundation of Rhegium. But this is hardly certain. Following Strabo (we have no better evidence) this is before the First Messenian War. This is no hard and fast proof of the low chronology, though it could be made to imply it. Every suggestion about the foundations and refoundations of Zancle and Rhegium is vulnerable. One point: the evidence, such as it is, does the high chronology little good.

Then there is the so-called Great Rhetra. Despite how much confusion this document has engendered, we may hazard the extraction of some chronological evidence from it. Tyrtaeus considered it an oracle from Apollo.<sup>95</sup> Given Xenophon's<sup>96</sup> description of Lycurgus at Delphi the Delphic approval of the Rhetra ought to be taken seriously.<sup>97</sup> Delphi's prominence dates to the second half<sup>98</sup> (indeed the last third!<sup>99</sup>) of the eighth century; the Rhetra dates from before the First Messenian War.<sup>100</sup> Confronting Delphi with the high chronology: after ca. 740–730 but before 736. This is a tight fit, probably impossible. It is only a guess that the Rhetra dates to a generation before the First Messenian War.<sup>101</sup> If it does, the high chronology is in serious danger. The low chronology fits easily.

<sup>95</sup> Tyrtaeus, fr. 4 WEST.

<sup>96</sup> Xenophon, *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* 8, 5.

<sup>97</sup> See in general J. FONTENROSE, *The Delphic Oracle*, Berkeley 1978, *passim*; for the Great Rhetra specifically, 271–272.

<sup>98</sup> See FORREST, *Colonisation and the Rise of Delphi*, *Historia* 6, 1957, 171.

<sup>99</sup> It seems to begin with the Chalcidian colonization of Sicily in 733: FORREST, l. c. (n. 98), 165 – though his dates for the foundation of Zancle and Rhegium are too high.

<sup>100</sup> I believe the Royal Rider is a rider (despite FORREST, *The Date of the Lykourgan Reforms in Sparta*, *Phoenix* 17, 1963, 159, and H. T. WADE-GERY, *The Spartan Rhetra in Plutarch*, in: *Essays in Greek History*, 37–85) and that Theopompus and Polydorus wrote it, as Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 6, says (for this point see FORREST, l. c. 158–160). It follows, then, that the Rhetra itself antedates the First Messenian War, as most scholars assume (e.g. K. M. T. CHRIMES, *Ancient Sparta*, Manchester 1949, 418; HAMMOND, *Studies*, 54–55; DEN BOER, l. c. [n. 68], 183; KIECHLE, *Lakonien und Sparta*, 255).

<sup>101</sup> KIECHLE, *Lakonien und Sparta*, 151, makes the attractive suggestion that the Rhetra's second clause («after the phyles have been phyled and the obes have been obed») refers to the incorporation of Amyclae, the citizens of which were at some time inducted into the old Dorian tribes (which were never replaced, as Tyrtaeus, fr. 19 WEST, and Pindar, *Pythian* 1, 121 with Scholium, show). Pausanias 3, 2, 6, says that Teleclus, Alcamenes' father, was king then. The datum may derive from an Amyclaeon source (Amyclaeon tradition preserved the king's name, during whose reign the town became part of Sparta), so the information may be sound. Teleclus' reign should have begun (on the high chronology) by at least 760 or so. On the low chronology: 715 or so.

The Rhetra is prose not poetry. Early Greeks such as Solon recorded their reforms in poetry: it could be remembered without being written down. Miss JEFFERY has concluded that ca. 750 is the date of the introduction of letters to Greece.<sup>102</sup> The earliest evidence she has dated to ca. 720. If the rhetra, being prose, was written, our problem remains the same: the low chronology makes perfect sense. The high chronology is difficult or impossible.

In Conclusion: Our only evidence for dating the First Messenian War to the second half of the eighth century is Pausanias, who has based his account on a worthless source. We have no supporting evidence for it, except possibly a confused and error-ridden foundation myth. We have information out of the fourth century B. C. that implies lower dates. It probably derives from a good source. Tyrtaeus, the fiery poet of the second war, wrote in the second half of the seventh century – he must bring the second war down with him. The foundation of Rhegium (though this point can hardly be pressed) bodes ill for the high chronology and may possibly be held to support the low: Messenians arrive at Rhegium in the very late eighth century; First Messenian War breaks out in the very early seventh. Pausanias' source for the Second Messenian War implies the low chronology. Counting Kings in the Eurypontid line supports the low chronology. The Agiad line produces similar results. Other genealogical evidence presupposes a low dating. The Great Rhetra (admittedly a debatable point) is more easily reconcilable with the low chronology. All of this should be allowed cumulative weight: A number of pieces of evidence (some debatable in and of themselves) tend to support the low chronology. None of them deny it. For the high chronology: nothing except that which is worthless. «Der Historiker glaubt nichts, bis es ihm bewiesen wird, daß es wahr ist.» BELOCH's dictum seems relevant: we have no proof for Pausanias' chronology and thus no reason to believe it. The high chronology must go. For the low chronology we have evidence; it should stand.

Therefore: The Second Messenian War ended in ca. 610–600. The date of its beginning can only be guessed at: ca. 635–625.<sup>103</sup> The First Messenian War was fought in the first half of the seventh century, two generations before the second.<sup>104</sup> Let us venture ca. 690–670.<sup>105</sup> These dates, although they must needs re-

<sup>102</sup> JEFFERY, *The local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford 1990, 12–21.

<sup>103</sup> Allowing the date of Tyrtaeus (after 640) to pull the war up slightly, while respecting the tendency of the accession of King Laotychidas I (ca. 615) to pull the war down.

<sup>104</sup> Pausanias gives an interval of thirty-nine years – i. e. one forty-year generation. His source is hardly clear: it may have been Rhianus, whose «date» for the second war seems to be more or less right. On the other hand, Pausanias ignored Rhianus' date. While it is not impossible to surmise that Pausanias neglected one date of his source while accepting another, the supposition needs proof. Myron of Priene may just as easily be held to have included an exact prophecy of the war to come.

<sup>105</sup> Depending how closely we wish to connect the first war with the settlement of Rhegium, we could possibly suggest 710–690. But we are then stretching the two-generation span to its breaking point.

main vague, may possibly provide a rudimentary chronological framework for early Spartan history.

*Appendix I*  
*The Fictitious Messenian Revolt of 491*

There is one piece of evidence which cannot be included in the main text. A rather silly passage of Diogenes Laertius,<sup>106</sup> which is usually traced back to Theopompus (FGrH 115, fr. 71), implies that Messenia retained her independence up to the lifetime of Pherecydes, a pupil of Pittacus of Mytilene. The traditional chronology dates Pittacus' tyranny to the years 590–580. Herodotus,<sup>107</sup> however, implies that Pittacus was a contemporary of Croesus. Pittacus' floruit would then belong to the middle years of the sixth century. His pupil's floruit may be then dated to ca. 550 or to ca. 520. It is ridiculous to speak of Messenian independence in the mid or very late sixth century. It is suggestive, however, that Plato<sup>108</sup> says that a Messenian War prevented the Spartans from helping Athens at Marathon in 491. Herodotus<sup>109</sup> knows of no such thing; it is probably a pious excuse, perhaps modeled on the Messenian Revolt of 465. Nonetheless, if Rhianus meant King Laotychidas II (which is doubtful), then he too would seem to imply a Messenian War in 490. Add to this Pausanias' confused reference to an early fifth century Messenian emigration to Rhegium.<sup>110</sup> Still it is hardly likely. Pausanias could not possibly have been misled into thinking that an epic poem about a Messenian Revolt in 490 (Who would write such a thing anyway?) referred to the Second Messenian War. This Messenian Revolt is unattested by reliable historical sources and looks spurious on any account, despite KIECHLE's variously floundering attempts to prove it. It has been effectively demolished by WADE-GERY, who gives full references to the previous literature.<sup>111</sup> Oddly enough, four pieces of evidence, none of them especially reliable or plausibly interpreted, could point toward it. WADE-GERY unfortunately proposes his own 'hypothesis', that Rhianus' war was a revolt in ca. 600. See above, note 8, for the problem with this proposal. Although Strabo<sup>112</sup> does refer to four Messenian Wars, Diodorus<sup>113</sup> knows of only three. Either we have a Strabonian slip or Strabo's immediate source (probably not Ephorus, because of Diodorus) noticed Plato's imaginary war. The probability is that Strabo erred.

---

<sup>106</sup> Diogenes Laertius 1, 116.

<sup>107</sup> Herodotus 1, 27, 2.

<sup>108</sup> Plato, *Leges*, p. 698 e.

<sup>109</sup> Herodotus 6, 106.120.

<sup>110</sup> See Nn. 88 and 89.

<sup>111</sup> H. T. WADE-GERY, *The 'Rhianos-hypothesis'*, *Festschrift Ehrenberg*, Oxford 1966, 289–302.

<sup>112</sup> Strabo 8, 4, 10, p. 362.

<sup>113</sup> Diodorus 15, 66, 3–4.

*Appendix II*  
*The Battle of Hysiae*

Pausanias says that in the year 669 Argos inflicted a severe defeat on Sparta at a place called Hysiae on the marches between the two rivals.<sup>114</sup> He goes on to say that King Theopompus, though old and feeble, was still alive at the time.<sup>115</sup> FORREST has presumptuously called Pausanias «absurd.»<sup>116</sup> FORREST dates the First Messenian War to ca. 736–716; it is of course «absurd» to imagine a seventy year reign for Theopompus. This ought to have been a disturbing omen that something was terribly amiss with the high chronology of the Messenian Wars. Pausanias is our only source for this battle; he gives a very precise date (Spartan king, olympiad, and Athenian archon) which few have wished to challenge.<sup>117</sup> If we arbitrarily dismiss the parts of his report, which we do not like, we may as well dismiss them all.

Pausanias says that Theopompus did not, in fact, command, so Polydorus must have been commander. The only other information we have on Polydorus is that he was assassinated after the First Messenian War;<sup>118</sup> we do know, however, that Pausanias went out of his way to say that there was neither Messenian nor Argive trouble during the reign of Polydorus' son, Eurycrates, but that the

<sup>114</sup> Pausanias 2, 24, 7 (for the exact date see Diodorus 3, 1, 3). The date may be dependent on that of Pheidon of Argos, a matter I hope to discuss in full at another time.

<sup>115</sup> Pausanias 3, 7, 5. The two passages are usually connected and rightly so; see n. 117.

<sup>116</sup> FORREST, l. c. (n. 100), 167.

<sup>117</sup> T. KELLY, Did the Argives defeat the Spartans at Hysiae in 669 B. C.?, *AJPh* 91, 1970, 31–42, has wished to deny the historicity of the entire battle. A good part of his argument relies on denigration of Pausanias (32–33; 34–35; 40–42) and his belief that no other historian mentions the battle. Pausanias himself is held to have cobbled together confused accounts on the spot, 39–40. Solinus, 7, 9, refers to a battle in the Thyreatis in the year 735; Jerome refers to a battle in the same region in 720. For these two dates see JACOBY, *Apollodors Chronik*, 129, n. 7. It is very likely that Solinus is using the Apollodoran dating for Theopompus (JACOBY, *Apollodors Chronik*, 128–130), whereas Jerome is relying on a slightly later dating of Theopompus (see n. 2). Both would then be referring to a battle at the very end of Theopompus' life. Pausanias seems to have had a reasonably good source for early Argive history – KELLY, 37–38. This source may then have been responsible for the date of 669.

I am not sure that the absence of an Argive king in the tradition precludes an Argive immediate source for Pausanias. Due to the presence of a Spartan king, it is possible that the local historian picked up the battle from a Spartan source (reflected at Pausanias 3, 7, 5?). He then used this king to date the battle. Local historians did, of course, venture to take material from outside sources; it was a Megarian chronicler (Dieu[ty]chidas: Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 1, 8) who worked out the Spartan genealogy which eventually became standard. I suspect he did so, because the Spartan kinglists provided the most accessible chronological framework. The date of 669 would then be the guess of an Argive local historian.

<sup>118</sup> Pausanias 3, 3, 2–3. He does not say, as HAMMOND, *Studies*, 99, implies, that he was killed soon after the end of the war. The Spartan victory serves only as a *terminus post quem*.

Messenians rebelled during the reign of Eurycrates' son, Anaxander.<sup>119</sup> As there was no Argive trouble in the reign of either Eurycrates or Anaxander, the implication could possibly be (as FORREST indeed assumes<sup>120</sup>) that there had been Argive trouble during the reign of Eurycrates' father, Polydorus. Despite HAMMOND's objections<sup>121</sup> Pausanias really should have had something in mind when he noted that Eurycrates' reign was devoid of Argive disturbances. If the explanation presented above be accepted, then we have additional evidence for a Spartan war against Argos during the reign of Polydorus.

Due to Tyrtaeus and Alcman the reigns of the seventh century were approachable to later historians; one may imagine that the name of the king in the report of the battle of Hysiae is correct. We do not, however, necessarily need to believe in the exact date (genealogical calculations can have drastically altered it) given, though we should accept the event itself and the reign. For a final verdict on the date of this battle (which I shall for now accept) a full investigation of the chronology of Pheidon of Argos is necessary, since he is often held to have been the Argive commander at the battle.

One final comment: The battle of Hysiae has often been casually used to back the high chronology of the Second Messenian War.<sup>122</sup> One assumes that the Messenians would have revolted immediately after the battle. This is only an assumption. Hysiae was at a far remove from Messenia; by the time the Messenians were fully cognizant of what had happened, the Spartans could have already taken preemptive measures. The situation does not parallel the Messenian Revolt of 465, in which the disaster was immediately apparent to all. The great earthquake ripped peaks from Mt. Taygetus; everyone knew that the Spartans must have suffered casualties and that they could be taken advantage of.<sup>123</sup>

It is not so simple with Hysiae; we have no reason to assume that Hysiae touched off the Second Messenian War. Assuming that the Spartans responded quickly, they could easily have averted the Messenian threat. It is instructive to refer to the battle of Leuctra in 371. Epaminondas inflicted a crushing defeat on the Spartans, yet the Messenians did not revolt until Epaminondas appeared in Messenia in 369. There is, then, no need whatsoever to assume that the Second Messenian War occurred immediately after the battle of Hysiae.

The Second Messenian War was probably a result of long-term planning on the part of the Messenians: they had allies<sup>124</sup> and, hence, must have spent some

<sup>119</sup> Pausanias 3, 3, 4.

<sup>120</sup> FORREST, l. c. (n. 100), 167.

<sup>121</sup> HAMMOND, *Studies*, 100.

<sup>122</sup> E. g. FORREST, *Sparta*, 69.

<sup>123</sup> Thucydides 1, 101; Plutarch, *Cimon* 16, 4; Pausanias 4, 24, 5–6; Diodorus 11, 63–64; 11, 84, 7–8; Scholiast to Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 1144.

<sup>124</sup> For this see KIECHLE, *Messenische Studien*, 23–31 or HUXLEY, l. c. (n. 8), 57. (HUXLEY mentions the fact that according to Apollodorus, FGrH 244, fr. 334 and Diogenes Laertius 1,

time in diplomatic overtures to various states; i. e. it was no sudden rebellion as the revolt of 465 undoubtedly was. Finally, King Theopompus, the victor of the First Messenian War, could not possibly have been alive on the eve of the Second Messenian War. This alone destroys any connection between Hysiae and the Second Messenian War. If Polydorus commanded at Hysiae, the same applies: he could not have been alive on the eve of the second war.

### *Appendix III* *The Conquest of Phigaleia*

I refer to one farther passage to demonstrate the problems we run into when we uncritically cull from Pausanias. According to him the Spartans took the Arcadian city of Phigaleia in 659.<sup>125</sup> Now Pausanias dates this with an Olympiad and an Athenian archon; we have, then, no idea how to relate it to Spartan history as we have no Spartan date. If a Spartan regnal date was originally converted into another system of dating (one cannot divine by whom), then we have no reason to expect that this date has any pretension to accuracy: it is years too early. In consequence I see no reason why we should accept Pausanias' date for the Spartan conquest of Phigaleia. If we do, however, nothing precludes our placing it after the First Messenian War and before the Second.<sup>126</sup>

Let us accept it then. What does it mean? It does not mean that Sparta conquered the Messenian town of Hira (the final battle of the Second Messenian War) in 657. Into what crystal ball GEORGE HUXLEY gazed to determine this I cannot discern.<sup>127</sup> Phigaleia lies northwestwards of Hira. Let us assume for the sake of argument, that the conquest of this city is in fact connected to the Second Messenian War. One would imagine that the final defeat of Messenia would allow the Spartans to attack and conquer a city beyond Hira. Phigaleia thus offers a terminus ante quem for the end of the Second Messenian War, which then runs (charitably) 670–660. The First Messenian War then runs ca. 740–720 – which is about right on the high chronology. But since we know that the Second Messenian War was a hard-fought war, we have no reason whatsoever to assume that it lasted for only ten years. Twenty is more reasonable, but to be reasonable might denude the theory of credibility. Nor do we have any reason to think that Phigal-

---

94, the Arcadian leader, Aristocrates, was the grandfather of the wife of Periander: this, he opines, supports a very early dating of the Second Messenian War. For this we need to understand how the genealogy was derived. Moreover, we need to establish the chronology of the Corinthian tyrants: on the low chronology Periander ruled ca. 590–550. Aristocrates would then be dated to the second half of the seventh century.)

<sup>125</sup> Pausanias 8, 39, 3.

<sup>126</sup> Phigaleia is some miles north of the plain of the upper Pamisus. It could have been conquered from that region after either war.

<sup>127</sup> HUXLEY, l. c. (n. 8), 57–58.

eia was taken immediately after the end of the Second Messenian War. Is it likely that after an exceedingly difficult war Sparta immediately invaded southwestern Arcadia? We should rather allow a few years time between Phigaleia and the conquest of Messenia. The dates of the First Messenian War, if we assign a reasonable length to the second war and allow a reasonable interval between the second war's end and the conquest of Phigaleia, ascend into the fog of prehistory. We must remember that the Messenian Olympic victor of 736 really ought to show that Messenia was still independent in that year. A datum that sends the First Messenian War to ca. 760–740 is likely to be false. But as there is no reason to assume any connection between Phigaleia and the Messenian Wars, there is no reason to date either war on the basis of this datum.

The taking of Phigaleia in 659 manifestly fails to prove anything about the dates of the Messenian Wars. Nor is there any real reason to grant Pausanias' date much trust. Even if we do, it need not affect any other date.

*Universität Heidelberg  
Seminar für Alte Geschichte  
Marstallhof 4  
6900 Heidelberg*



